

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 21-25, and 30 are pending.

Claims 16-20 and 26-29 have been cancelled.

In the Office Action mailed December 10, 2009, claims 12-21 were rejected under § 101; claims 12-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ankireddipally (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,216); and claims 12-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Scheier (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0035584).

Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 1-11. Claim 8 has been amended to tie claim 8 to a computer. Support for “computer” can be found at least in Fig. 1 and the accompanying text of the present application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

As suggested by the Office Action on page 9, Applicant has added “one or more processors” in claim 12. Moreover, independent claim 22 has been amended to tie the tasks of claim 22 to a computer. Support for “one or more processors” and “computer” can be found in Fig. 1 and the accompanying text of the present application.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 OVER ANKIREDDIPALLY OR SCHEIER

Independent claim 12 has been amended to recite a computer readable storage medium to store first and second schema definitions generated based on transaction definitions for a target system, where the first schema definition is to map one or more parameters of a first of the transaction definitions to a document written in a self-describing language, and where the second schema definition is to map a document written in the self-describing language into one or more parameters associated with a second of the transaction definitions. Support for “target system” can be found at least in Fig. 3 of the present application, which shows one example of a target system in the form of a legacy system 78. Support for the first and second schema definitions as defined in the new clause of claim 12 can be found at least in the text accompanying Fig. 2 of the present application.

Claim 12 has also been amended to recite the following additional element:

wherein the first transaction message is to be sent to the target system;

wherein the document generator is executable to further receive, from the target system, a response message that is responsive to the first transaction message, and convert the response message into a second document according to the second schema definition, wherein the second document is written in the self-describing language;

wherein the object generator is executable to further generate a second object from the second document; and

wherein the software service is executable to use the second object to provide, to the requestor, data responsive to the transaction request.

Support for the foregoing subject matter of claim 12 can be found at least in the following passages of the present application: page 12, line 28 – page 14, line 13.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Ankireddipally nor Scheier discloses use of the first and second schema definitions (as defined by claim 12) in the manner recited in claim 12. The first schema definition of claim 12 is used for processing of a transaction request from a requestor, whereas the second schema definition is used for processing of response data back to the requestor.

With respect to Ankireddipally, the Office Action identified the DTDs mentioned in column 15, lines 59-66, as constituting the “schema” of claim 12. The passage in column 15 of Ankireddipally cited by the Office Action states that an XML document

contains tags that define a message header and message content, and that each of these parts has an associated DTD. However, the DTDs mentioned in Ankireddipally do not constitute the first and second schema definitions generated based on transaction definitions as recited in claim 12, as used in the manner recited in claim 12.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is clearly not anticipated Ankireddipally.

Scheier discloses a BizTalk server 1140 (see Fig. 11 of Scheier) that contains schemas 1142, where the BizTalk server 1140 is able to receive an XML message, such that the BizTalk can transform the XML message into a format that is recognized by a legacy system or a third party system. Scheier, ¶ [0180]. However, Scheier does not disclose first and second schema definitions generated based on transaction definitions for a target system, as recited in claim 12, in combination with use of the first and second schema definitions as recited in claim 12 for a transaction request in a first direction and response data in a second direction.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is not anticipated by Scheier.

Independent claim 22 has been amended in similar fashion as claim 12. Similar support exists for the amendment of claim 22 in the specification.

Claim 22 is not anticipated by Ankireddipally or Scheier for similar reasons as stated above with respect to claim 12.

CONCLUSION

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (200901488-2).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 10, 2010

/Dan C. Hu/

Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883